

## **REMARKS**

This supplemental amendment is submitted as a supplement to the amendment filed on June 8, 2010. As such, the amendments made to the claims in the previously filed amendment have been made of record, and therefore, will not be repeated in this supplemental amendment. In addition, the arguments made in the previously filed amendment are considered of record and will not be repeated.

### **I. Telephone Interviews**

Initially, the Applicants would like to thank Examiner Ravetti for granting and conducting the telephone interviews on June 28, 2010, July 21, 2010, October 28, 2010 and November 12, 2010.

During the telephone interviews the Applicants' representative discussed several options for amending the claims in order to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 and § 112 rejections set forth in the Office Action dated March 8, 2010. As a result of the interviews, the Examiner kindly suggested filing a supplemental amendment to further amend the claims so as to overcome the above-mentioned rejections.

### **II. Amendments to the Claims**

In view of the above-mentioned interview, independent claims 24, 29, 32 and 34 have been amended to clarify that each of the license management server, the relay server, and the terminal device includes at least one processor, and have been amended to clarify that the various processors are programmed to operate as various units. Now, independent claims 24, 29, 32 and 34 clearly require specific hardware.

Additionally, independent method claim 35 has been amended to tie the claimed method to another statutory class (i.e., an apparatus/system requiring specific hardware).

Furthermore, independent claims 24, 29, 32 and 34 have been amended to remove the “operable” language and to recite “active” language requiring specific structure.

Finally, claim 25 has been amended to more closely relate the claimed invention with the written description of paragraph [0063].

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Satoshi NIWANO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.12.16 14:31:23 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 16, 2010